

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10/736,232 12/15/2003 Godwin Liu 22126.0002U1 3147 23859 07/26/2005 **EXAMINER** 7590 NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C. JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J **SUITE 1000 ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER 999 PEACHTREE STREET ATLANTA, GA 30309-3915 3737

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<i>&</i>
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/736,232	LIU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jaworski Francis J.	3737
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Septonsion</u> This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise. 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	•
Disposition of Claims		•
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 - 22 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 - 22 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 July 2004</u> is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to t drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09202004	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	

Page 2

Specification

DETAILED ACTION

The specification is queried regarding the use of the terms "scan line based image reconstruction". Specification para [0025] appears to suggest that individual scanlines are registered to the ECG and therefore serve as the unit by which the composite image set is refreshed. Paras [0038 and 0039] appear to dilute this definition by intimating that a region of either two-dimensional or three-dimensional type may alternatively be used as a 'scan line based image reconstruction' i.e. set of scanlines or a volume subsector. Applicants are requested to clarify the scope of this term particularly since in the trivial sense nearly all ultrasound image operations are based upon scanlines due to the physical demand of ensonating directionally with a pressure wave.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster et al (IEEE Ultrasound Symposium 200 pp. 1633 et seq., of record with the September 20, 2004 IDS submission) in view of Bonnefous (US5579771) or Newman (US6544175) or Clark (US6139500) or Hongo et al (US4991589).

The former establishes that high frequency high frame rate scanning is appurtenant to volume cardiac scanning of the rapidly beating yet proximally located mouse heart (proximity enables high frequencies otherwise severely attenuable to be used.). It would have been obvious in view of Bonnefous cols. 10-11 bridging to achieve higher frame rates by collapsing image field widths obtained with cardiac cycle registry so that with the maximum line acquisition rate fixed by sound velocity echo latency is distributed among more frames, since a mouse heart is rather small in spatial extent. In the alternative a similar argument may be made for the subvolume cardiosynched imaging of Newman col. 6 lines 3-45, or the 'available departure time' approach of Clark which is a more flexible variant of volumetric scanning in which spatio-temporal image data gaps are filled using full scan planes fired at correct spatial and temporal departures with the latter indexed by progression of the ECG. Finally in Hongo et al Fig. 4 the subframes are assembled into frames using ECG registry with particular attention to bloodflow analysis.

Art Unit: 3737

Alternatively stated and with attention to the specification ambiguity serving to define the claims terminology, the Examiner is taking the position that, given that high frequency high frame rate scanning was known for small animal study, the breaking up of volumes or frames into subunits or collapsed width frames under acquisition in accordance with ECG timings to achieve higher frame rates would have been wellknown in the art.

Powers et al (US5099847) and Thomenius (US4572202) are cited to complete the record as directed to high frame rate ultrasound imaging.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738.

FJJ:fjj

07-21-2005

Francis J. Jaworski **Primary Examiner**